

# Alex Krainer: The Real Engine Behind US-Iran Tensions

See Full Interview: <https://www.youtube.com/live/8ELGP4iroAg?si=9RAIuT4-948QMXDG> Follow me: Substack: [https://substack.com/@dialogueworks?utm\\_campaign=profile&utm\\_medium=profile-page](https://substack.com/@dialogueworks?utm_campaign=profile&utm_medium=profile-page) X (Twitter): [https://x.com/Dialogue\\_NRA](https://x.com/Dialogue_NRA) Patreon: [https://patreon.com/Dialogueworks?utm\\_medium=unknown&utm\\_source=join\\_link&utm\\_campaign=creatorshare\\_creator&utm\\_content=](https://patreon.com/Dialogueworks?utm_medium=unknown&utm_source=join_link&utm_campaign=creatorshare_creator&utm_content=)

## #Nima

With what has happened last night, again the United States and Iran are attacking each other. We've learned that the United States has announced that they attacked one of the Iranian cities in the southern part of Iran, Bandar Abbas. And then what happened is that they hit some targets in that city. We don't know, because the United States is not, obviously, they're not honestly reporting on what's going on there. But they're saying Iran attacked us, and we responded to the Iranian attack. Then later on, we learned from the Iranian media that it was an American oil tanker. It tried to pass through the Strait of Hormuz with its transponder switched off, and IRGC naval forces fired on the vessel, forcing it to stop and turn back. That was the whole situation. Then the United States attacked an empty patch of land near the city of Bandar Abbas.

No casualties or damage were reported. Then today we learned that Iran attacked an American base in Kuwait. They targeted Americans with missiles and drones. We don't know what has happened, or if some of these drones or missiles hit the target. Yet there is no report on that. But we know that they fired missiles and drones at the American base in Kuwait. And here is what's going on with the Trump administration. It seems that they are talking with the Iranians. We have, as you know, the Iranian delegation going to Qatar about the frozen Iranian assets, and there are some positive signs there. On the other hand, you see no serious negotiations between the two sides. And these sorts of attacks—they're attacking each other. What do you make of what's going on in the Middle East?

## #Alex

Well, I think that in the United States administration, there's a tug of war between people who want to continue and escalate the war and people who want to end it. And it seems to me that Trump is among those who want to end it, but he is obviously under tremendous pressure from people who want to continue the war, which I think are the Zionists, the Jewish Zionists around him and their servants. People like Stephen Miller, people like his donors. And then, you know, I would like to know about the American command and control hierarchy, because I sometimes wonder whether, you know, structures like CENTCOM and AFRICOM aren't compromised. Because, you know, every so often it seems that they're on a rampage somewhere.

That's not even being reported, you know, like bombardments of Somalia that have gone on this year in huge volumes. So it seems to me that there's some kind of a strange internal conflict. And I would guess that the Iranians are largely aware of this and that they themselves are conducting their side of the war very cautiously in order to avoid their enemies closing ranks, in order to avoid uniting their enemies. So I think that these sporadic skirmishes that we see every so often are the result of that. Somebody will somehow encourage the master of a tanker to try to run the Strait of Hormuz, so that, you know, if they're successful, they could say like, aha, you see, we were able to do it. So come on, everybody.

And then it goes badly. And now, you know, the military has to respond somehow, but maybe they're not quite comfortable escalating the war. So they bomb an empty field. And then why the Iranians bombed the Kuwaiti air base, I wouldn't know. But we also know that Iran has partly decentralized their command and control structure exactly because they don't want to be defeated in case the central government in Tehran falls. So there's a honeycomb of centers—31, if I understood correctly—where IRGC commanders have a large degree of autonomy and will continue to fight even if the central government told them not to. So it could be some commander's autonomous decision for whatever reason. It could be a mistake. Who knows? Yeah.

## **#Nima**

Yeah. I think the problem that Donald Trump is facing, Alex, is that he has done everything for Israel so far. There are no actions on his part left to be implemented. I don't know what else Israel is asking for when it comes to the war in the Middle East and how, because Ben-Gvir just yesterday said that they cannot make a deal, you know, with Iran—he's talking about the United States—that would be some sort of bad deal for Israel. Every deal, I would say, there is no good deal for Israel right now. Everything that they're going to get out of these negotiations, these talks, is going to be bad for Israel, because they created this sort of chaos and situation for themselves. It's not Iran creating that. It's not Iran attacking Israel and the United States. It is the United States and Israel attacking Iran and changing Iranian attitude. The case of the Strait of Hormuz is one of the most obvious reasons for that.

## **#Alex**

Yes, and not only that, but they have started to unite their allies against themselves as well. Because, I don't know, maybe before February 28th, you could have pressured the Gulf, the Emirates, Qatar, Kuwait, Saudi Arabia to sign up to the Abraham Accords. And remember Trump's speech to the Arab Gulf Council a few months ago? People were very happy to hear that. That sounded very inspirational: we're not going to interfere, we're going to leave your politics to you, you will determine your future, blah, blah, blah. So at that time, I think that Trump had enough political capital where he could have persuaded some of those nations into signing up to the Abraham Accords.

No, it's not even possible. They have all rejected it. And Israel is really, truly isolated. And not only is it isolated, it's losing capability to wage war. It's increasingly vulnerable. There are more desertions. There are more people who don't turn up for military duty. They're sustaining casualties every day. And they have not defeated one enemy from their long list of enemies. Not a one. And now, you know, rather than destroying Iran, regime-changing it, weakening it, they have a much, much more powerful enemy. And they've also lost support in the United States. You know, maybe not from the federal government in Washington, but among the people.

So it can't go on much longer. But it seems to me that the Israeli political class no longer has the ability to regroup, to say, okay, this is not working. We're going to have to make nice with our neighbors. And we're going to have to plan our future on some other basis than ethno-supremacism and hegemony. We're going to have to make Palestinians equal under our democracy. None of that is possible. So basically, all they have left is a path of self-destruction. And they're only becoming more determined to go down that route to the bitter end. You know, it's almost hard to believe that this is happening, but it is happening.

And I don't know, it's like a deeply teachable moment in history that a leadership in a country can be so fanatically devoted to one set of principles and one set of goals that they're willing to pay every price for it. And then also, you know, it's a danger to the whole rest of the world because if you listen to some of these people, they're perfectly willing and capable of using nuclear weapons, not just against Iran, but against anybody. You know, they're capable of launching one on Paris, on London, on Rome, Madrid. It doesn't matter. They're like, if we're going down, we're taking everybody with us. And this is who we're dealing with.

But everybody is hysterical about Iran having nuclear weapons because Iran is such a great danger to the world. These Zionist fanatics, that's fine. They're the only democracy in the Middle East, so nothing to fear there. Look, if they're capable of killing children in their tens of thousands, what are they not capable of? And I think that that's ultimately one of those mythological situations where, you know, Icarus flies too close to the sun. And now it's, you know, it's the... in the Wile E. Coyote cartoon, the lesson is in gravity. I think that Israel is already falling, but you know, when you fall, it's not the fall that kills you. It's when you come to a sudden stop at the end.

## **#Nima**

Alex, in your opinion, from what's going on between Iran and ISIS, at best, what can they get out of these sorts of messages between the two sides? What is the best thing coming out of this sort of, I don't know if we can call it negotiation, this sort of, you know, messages that are going back and forth between the two sides?

## **#Alex**

The best, I would say, is a temporary truce, a delay in war. Because the only reason why Iran has prevailed is because they were able to prevail by force, by the force of their military action. If Iran was weaker, they would be overrun. And you can see that. The Trump administration—but I don't want to just speak about the Trump administration, because this is a continuity in policy from one administration to the other. Whatever they talk about during the electoral cycle, the policy is always the same. If you're strong, if you can defend yourself, and if you can inflict harm on your enemy, then they don't attack you. But if you're weak, then they overrun you. Afghanistan, Libya, Syria, and so forth.

And so that is going to persist. The incentives that are behind this continuity of policy, they are not going to change until the whole monetary system is changed. Because the incentives for imperial wars always go back to the banking cartel. Because taking political control of a region, of a nation, of a colony, is how they extract wealth from those regions. And that's what it's all about. So that's not going to go away. So these wars against Russia, against Iran, they're not going to stop until this whole system is defeated. And that system, you know, what we learned from the Trump administration is that this system still has the ultimate political power.

That even if the American people say no more wars, we vote for the candidate who promises us no more wars. And even if that candidate appears to have the intention to stop opening new wars, when push comes to shove, they prevail. They have their way. The Adelsons, the Larry Ellisons, the Bill Ackmans, and Paul Singers — these billionaire Jewish donors apparently have the ultimate sway over American foreign policy. And so we have to assume that that's going to stay the case. The only way Iran survives is by actually defending themselves by force, not by making a peace deal that the United States is then going to respect.

Oh, we signed the deal, so we have to honor our commitments — because they never do. They never honor their commitments. So let's say that right now the conflict ends. Maybe 10 years from now, there's a government crisis. There's some kind of crisis where the government's a bit wobbly. There's maybe a chance to get in and orchestrate a color revolution. That would open the opportunity again. And this war machine from the West would ramp up immediately into action. They would not stop. And so Iran is permanently at risk. Russia is permanently at risk. Belarus is permanently at risk. China is permanently at risk.

Every country that defends its independence and sovereignty is perpetually at risk, with the exception maybe of countries that have no natural resources. There's nothing to steal there. So then, you know, maybe they're left alone for that reason. So what's the choice? You know, does the world divide into two blocs and then each bloc lives a separate existence? Or do the powers like Iran, China, and Russia take this war all the way to the end until they completely destroy this war machine from the West, which means that you have to disenfranchise the global banking cartel and you have to force a change of the monetary system.

## **#Nima**

Does that mean they have to make the war unaffordable for the United States?

## **#Alex**

Well, you know, countries can continue waging war even after they appear to be completely broke, because they will continue extracting wealth from their citizens. And there's always wealth. And, you know, like, I think that this is partly the reason why they're on the rampage in South America, for example. Because now they want to take control of Bolivia, they want to take control of Peru, they want to take control of Ecuador, they already kind of took control of Venezuela, although I think that that could slip away. They want to take control of Cuba. Greenland's in the crosshairs, Canada's in the crosshairs.

I think that's a frenzied march to extract as much wealth from wherever they can to continue to feed this war machine. And it doesn't matter if the American people suffer, British people, French people, German people suffer intolerable conditions. Ukraine went through more than 30 years of that war. And then they pushed her into war against Russia, and they've been waging that war for four years, even though the country is completely broke, right? They print money and give it to them. And so, you know, I wouldn't be optimistic that the wars will stop because somebody in the United States will reach the conclusion that they're unaffordable. You know, they could have reached that conclusion 40 years ago.

But the machine keeps on keeping on. And wherever it sees a weakness, wherever it sees an opening, it attacks. And so I think that you have two choices. Again, you can carve out two blocks, have a cold war between them again for two generations, or you can continue to wage that war until one side is completely defeated. And I don't mean that the war is necessarily going to continue by military means, but it could continue through diplomatic and legal and administrative means, and, you know, sanctions and trade measures, you know, like you can't have rare earth minerals anymore. So we're not out of the woods by a long shot, basically because the war dynamic that's coming from the West is completely relentless.

And, you know, this whole discussion about Iran's nuclear program, nobody really cares about that. It's just a way to exert pressure on the Iranians and to force them to make concessions. And you know what happens when countries make concessions? We move the goalposts. Now you have to make more concessions or else we're going to hurt you. Now you make more concessions, and then they move the goalposts even farther. The objective is regime change. Everything else is just fodder for public consumption, for the PR machinery to say, oh, Iranians are very, very bad. We have to do something about it. They can't have a nuclear weapon.

You know, we have to stop them. Oh, the Strait of Hormuz has to be open. All of these are side issues. The central issue is taking political control of Iran because it's a large country, it's a resource-

rich country, and for as long as it's independent, for as long as it wants to chart its own course into the future, they're an obstacle to Western empire's hegemony. So that's the objective. If Iranians said tomorrow, okay, we're giving up the nuclear program completely, zero enrichment, not even the 3.26, whatever the number is, then they would say, ah, yes, but we also want you to give up your ballistic missile program.

And then if the Iranians said, like, okay, fine, we're going to give up our ballistic missile program, then they would say, well, you also have to dismantle the universities where you teach nuclear physics. Then if Iran said, okay, fine, we're going to do that, then they would say, well, you have to, you know, become a member of the World Health Organization, and everybody in Iran has to be vaccinated with mRNA vaccines every six months. You know, now I'm taking it too far, but the goalposts would continue to move against Iran as far as they can take it, and then at a certain point they will say, we can no longer tolerate Iranian intransigence, now we have to go to war. So that dynamic is still the moving principle of the Western war machine. So all this talk about Hormuz and the nuclear program and the ballistic program and the veils, the women, and democracy, all of this is just kind of the garnish for the narrative.